



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Infra Cumas, sub promontorium Misenum, appellant Troiani. Eo enim ducunt omnia, ut non in Baiano, quod vulgo creditur, quodque alias narratum ex Aurelio Victore¹⁶ intelligitur, sed in Cumano littore Troianorum classis stationem habuerit. Nec aliter Ovidius tradit, ubi Vergili vestigiis insisit.

It is interesting to note here that a hundred years ago the belief was prevalent ("vulgo creditur") that the landing-place was in *Baiano*, a belief which seems to have disappeared pretty generally¹⁷, perhaps through Heyne's influence. But after all Heyne states no arguments: "omnia" should be itemized, if it is to have weight. Nor does he explain how he understands the passage of Ovid. In another place (Excursus IV of Book 6) he quotes the passage from Dionysius which was mentioned above, and says:

Virgilius discessit ab aliorum fide etiam in hoc, quod non in Baiano sinu sed ultra Misenum versus Cumas classem appulsam esse voluit.

Here Heyne acknowledges that the tradition as given elsewhere than in the *Aeneid* is against his own view.

Norden makes no direct statement, in his edition of *Aeneid* 6, of his opinion in the matter of the landing-place, but there are hints that he took Misenum to be the place. Commenting (on page 114) on the words *pars densa ferarum tecta rapit silvas* (7-8), he says that, at the place where the Trojans sought water and wood, in Vergil's time rich men were building luxurious country-houses, a Latin colony was founded, and a naval station was established. In describing Misenum, Beloch (190) says something very similar to this, mentioning the same three characteristics; and, since Norden used Beloch's Campanien as a topographical guide¹⁸, it is a safe inference that Norden's description refers to Misenum. This view of his opinion is corroborated by a part of his note on verses 156-157: "Von Cumae nach Misenum führten und führen noch heute zwei Wege". This information is supplied by the editor at the moment when Aeneas, leaving the Sibyl's cave, started on the way toward his fleet, and is appropriate only if Aeneas was going to Misenum.

Henry appears to have believed that the place was Baiae; this is an inference from a note in his *Aeneidea*, on Book 5. 813-814:

Tutus quos optas portus accedet Averni.
Unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres.

Henry recommends Servius's punctuation of this passage—full stop after *accedet*—and upholds the superiority of this arrangement by the following argument:

It strikes me that a Roman poet was more likely to go out of his way to find a less ominous appellation for a veritable *portus Averni*, had he been under the necessity of speaking of one, than to go out of his way in search of so unlucky an equivocal for the port of Baiae.

¹⁶The reference here is to the passage quoted above in this paper from the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, ascribed to Aurelius Victor.

¹⁷However, a friend of the writer of this paper contributes the information that an Italian guide affirmed that Aeneas landed at Baiae. See also what is said below of Norden and Henry.

¹⁸He says so in his commentary (page 116, bottom).

The sentence is mazy, but the impression it conveys is that Baiae would not appear so suddenly upon the scene unless in Henry's mind the thought of Aeneas landing in Campania had been connected with Baiae. It may be recalled here that, when Agrippa constructed "a veritable *portus Averni*", by joining Lucrinus to Avernus, the harbor received a very auspicious name, *Portus Iulius*.

We may sum up thus. There is direct testimony in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, in Ovid, too, unless the text is altered, that the legend told that Aeneas disembarked at *Portus Misenum* or near it; there is the historical fact that actual travellers to Cumae landed at Puteoli and Baiae; in Vergil's account there is nothing that forces the conclusion that he had in mind a place on the outer coast, and there is one phrase—*inter saxa*—which suggests the *Portus Misenum*. It is at least possible that Vergil followed the same form of the Aeneas legend as Dionysius and Ovid.

THE BREARLEY SCHOOL,
NEW YORK

SUSAN FOWLER

REVIEWS

Roman Essays and Interpretations. By W. Warde Fowler. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1920). Pp. 290.

The *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace. By Tenney Frank. *American Journal of Philology* 42.324-330 (October, 1921).

Horace Carm. I 14. By Walter Leaf. <The English> *Journal of Philology* 34.283-289 (1918).

Since no review can do justice to such a volume as Dr. Fowler's book, I set down, in very particular fashion, its contents. After certain items are added below, in square brackets, references to the periodicals in which the articles were originally published.

Part I. The Latin History of the Word *Religio*, 7-15 [Transactions of the Congress for the History of Religions, 1908]; The Original Meaning of the Word *Sacer*, 15-24 [Journal of Roman Studies, 1911]; *Mundus Patet*, 24-37 [*ibidem*, 1912]; The Oak and the Thunder-God, 37-41; The *Toga Praetexta* of Roman Children, 42-52; Was the Flaminica Dialis Priestess of Juno?, 52-55 [The Classical Review 9.474-476]; The Origin of the Lar Familiaris, 56-64; *Fortuna Primigenia*, 64-70; Passing Under the Yoke, 70-75 [The Classical Review 27.48-51]; Note on Privately Dedicated Roman Altars, 75-79; The Pontifices and the Ferae: The Law of Rest-days, 79-90.

Part II. On the Date of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 91-99; The *Lex Frumentaria* of Gaius Gracchus, 99-110 [English Historical Review, 1905]; The *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace and its Performance, June 3d, 17 B. C., 111-126 [The Classical Quarterly 4.145-155]; On the *Laudatio Turiae* and its Additional Fragment, 126-138 [The Classical Review 19.261-266]; An Unnoticed Trait in the Character of Julius Caesar, 138-145 [The Classical Review 30.68-71].

Part III. Ancient Italy and Modern Borneo: A Study in Comparative Culture, 146-165 [Journal of Roman Studies, 1916]; *Parallela Quaedam*, 165-181 (the items here are The Plague of Locusts in 125 B. C.: And a Modern Parallel, 165-167; Plagues of Field-Voles [*Arvicola arvalis*] in Ancient and Modern Times,

167-169; Armati Terram Exercent: And a Modern Parallel, 169-170; The Disappearance of the Earliest Latin Poetry: And a Modern Parallel, 171-173; Roman *Leges Datae* and English Enclosure Awards, 173-178; The Great Serpent of the River Bagradas, 178-181).

Part IV. Vergiliana (the items are The Swans in *Aeneid* I. 390 ff., 181-182; The Harbour in *Aeneid* III. 533-6, 182-183; Note on Dido and Aeneas, 183-188; Note on *Aeneid* V. 5-6, 189-190; *Aeneid* V. 197 [on the word *nefas*], 190; Notes on *Aeneid* IX, X, XI, 181-209); Notes on Horace, Odes, III 1-6, 210-229; Berthold Georg Niebuhr: A Sketch, 229-250; Theodor Mommsen. His Life and Work, 250-268; The Tragic Element in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, 286-287; Index of Latin Words and Phrases, 289-290.

Dr. Fowler looks on the toga praetexta as a holy garment worn by priests during the time of sacrifice, and by magistrates who had the right to sacrifice on behalf of the State. As worn by children too, it was originally a holy garment, for the children of *ingenui*, both boys and girls, were regularly employed in the household as ministrants attending on daily sacrifice (43).

In the article on the Lex Frumentaria of Gaius Cracchus, by which it was proposed that grain should be sold in the capital to any one applying for it, at the rate of 6½ asses per modius, as against the average price, 16 asses or a denarius, Dr. Fowler defends the law against the strictures of modern historians and economists. He sums up, on page 104, thus:

... Cracchus's object was. . . (1) to prevent sudden and violent fluctuations in the market-price of corn, which were dangerous both politically and economically; (2) to stimulate the production of corn in Italy, in harmony with the spirit of his brother's agrarian law, and in immediate connexion with his own; to keep the agricultural population on the land, and to facilitate the transport of their produce and its safe warehousing at Rome.

In the paper on the Carmen Saeculare Dr. Fowler takes issue with the view, advocated for instance by Mommsen and Wissowa, that the hymn was sung in procession. He takes exception, also, to the view set forth in Jordan-Hülse, *Römische Topographie* 3.72, that the temple of Apollo lay at the Northeastern corner of the Palatine Hill. He believes that the real site was where the temple of Jupiter Victor is generally supposed to be, overlooking the Forum Boarium and the Circus Maximus, whence there is an uninterrupted view over the Campus Martius, with the Capitol in the foreground a little to the right—a point of importance, he says, for his interpretation of the Carmen (119).

... Here was space enough for a grand area enclosing the temple to north, south, and west, and in this open space a few very simple movements would enable the chorus to command every other site of religious or historical interest in the city, now adorned in all directions with new or restored buildings.

On pages 119-123, Dr. Fowler holds that the first eighteen stanzas of the hymn might have been rendered on this site; the nineteenth and last stanza, he believes, was sung only on the Capitoline Hill, at the performance of the Hymn there. In the Area Capi-

tolina the choirs would have had ample space for evolutions, and from it at the same time they would have been able to see almost every other important religious site in Rome.

On this Capitoline site, then, says Dr. Fowler, as the choirs sang the first three stanzas, they would be facing the new temple of Apollo, which was in full view across the Forum Boarium and the Velabrum.

... The site of the Tarentum across the Campus Martius was of course visible from the southern end of the area, and here the choirs would be during the next five stanzas, while they would wheel again to the west when they reached the second Apolline passage. They would be drawn up in front of the great temple during the Capitoline stanzas that follow, and would wheel about once more for the three Apolline ones with which the singing had concluded on the Palatine (124).

The final nineteenth stanza, summing up the whole performance, seems to Dr. Fowler extremely clever, because Horace contrives to bring in Jupiter as after all the presiding genius of Rome, and yet manages to make the final touch an Apolline one, as would in fact be fitting on a day especially dedicated to the Augustan Apollo. Phoebus and Diana are not here alluded to as the controllers of the destinies of Rome, but as the deities in whose honor the choirs, now about to disperse, have learnt and sung this hymn.

Dr. Fowler sums up as follows (126):

... Augustus chose the two finest religious sites in Rome, from each of which everything could be seen that was to be alluded to in the hymn, for the complete performance; so far yielding to popular feeling and conviction as to fix the second and last performance for the Capitoline, the real religious centre of the whole empire: but astutely taking care that the *interest* of this third day's entertainment should be closely connected with himself and the new régime, and that the religious colouring of the ritual and the hymn should be emphatically Apolline.

Professor Frank's discussion of this poem is most ingenious and distinctly interesting. By a special study of the caesura in it, he sought to determine which stanzas were sung by the boys alone, which by the girls alone, and which were sung antiphonally, and, finally, to prove who are the chief deities of the poem. He thinks that lines containing a 'trochaic or a feminine' caesura (compare 19 *siderum regina* | *bi-cornis audi*) were especially appropriate, by reason of their "smooth, flowing, and soft effects", to the maidens. He believes, therefore, that a reasonable rule for dividing the stanzas between the boys and the girls is this:

... stanzas sung by youths alone have the "masculine" caesura, stanzas sung by maidens alone one or more trochaic caesuras in each stanza, ensemble stanzas also contain trochaic caesuras.

His final division is as follows: stanzas 1-2, ensemble, choral parodos; 3, youths; 4-5, maidens; 6-8, youths; 9-11, ensemble (antiphonal mesodos); 12, youths; 13, maidens; 14-16, ensemble; 17, youths; 18, maidens; 19, ensemble.

Further, Professor Frank maintains that, by this division, the central place, the place of honor, is given

to Apollo and Diana. He is thus, on this point, in full agreement with Dr. Fowler.

The unnoticed trait in the character of Julius Caesar is (140) "a tendency, common at the time, to take an interest in ancient procedure, especially that of religion". For example, in his account of the civilization of the Gauls, Caesar gives great prominence to religion (B. G. 6.13-19). Even to this day this account forms a considerable part of what we know of early Celtic religion.

I wish there were space to consider the article on The Disappearance of the Earliest Latin Poetry. I may, however, note that, in The Classical Quarterly 15.31-37 (January, 1921), there was an article, by Miss (?) Ethel Mary Steuart, entitled The Earliest Narrative Poetry of Rome. The author emphasizes the evidence for the existence, prior to Livius Andronicus, of a school of native Italian poetry, consisting of short quasi-lyrical eulogies and dirges, poems of a mythological religious character, half-legendary, half-historical lays, and, finally, poems dealing with authenticated historical characters. She thus harks back to the position of Niebuhr and Macaulay, set forth so entertainingly by the latter in the Preface to his Lays of Ancient Rome. I have learned recently, also, that, some years ago, there was accepted at the University of Wisconsin a Dissertation, by E. A. Hooton, called The Pre-Hellenistic Stage in the Evolution of the Literary art at Rome. This has, however, not yet been published.

In the Note on Dido and Aeneas (183-188), Dr. Fowler takes issue with the tendency of modern times to throw the whole blame upon Aeneas. He thinks of Aeneas as, throughout the Aeneid, the impersonation of family life and affection, and of the other ties which bind civilized men together, friendship, hospitality, good faith, and justice. He next reminds us that, in the traditional form of the Dido story, the queen had resolved to remain a widow after the murder of her husband, Sychaeus; therefore, in order to escape the suit of Iarbas, with which her own subjects urged her to comply, she erected a great pile of wood near her palace, and, setting fire to it, threw herself into the flames. This story Vergil altered (185), "in order to contrast the fury of ungovernable love, love of the animal type, with the settled order, affection, and obedience, of the Roman family life". On page 187 he says:

Vergil had good reason to draw this terrible picture of an infatuated woman. In his own day Cleopatra had poisoned the mind of one, if not two, great Romans, and the escape of Augustus from her charms was a matter of enormous importance in the history of Rome, as all his contemporaries knew. . . .

In the Notes on Horace, Dr. Fowler deals with the famous first six odes of Book 3. He takes issue with the view, first suggested by Mommsen, and elaborated by Professor von Domaszewski, of Heidelberg, that we are to interpret these poems historically. Von Domaszewski, for instance, held that the poems were written at one time and with one object, to illustrate

the inscription on the shield of gold set up in Augustus's honor, in 27 B. C., by Senate and people.

This inscription testified to the *virtus, clementia, iustitia*, and *pietas*, of the Princes; and Domaszewski sees in these odes, (except the first, of which he says nothing) a sermon or sermons on these Augustan virtues; viz. two on *Virtus*, three on *Iustitia*, four on *Clementia*, five on *Virtus* again, and six on *Pietas*.

Dr. Fowler refuses to believe that the six poems were written at one time. He even goes so far as to suggest that the first ode was placed where it is when the six odes were collected. He suggests that its first stanza was added at this time; he notes that the ode might commence "quite naturally and after Horace's familiar manner with the fifth line". All students of Horace will find Dr. Fowler's further discussion of these odes intensely interesting. There is space here, however, to dwell only upon one matter—his discussion of the third ode. This ode is concerned, he holds, not as Domaszewski thought, with *iustitia*, but with constancy of purpose. The words *tenax propositi*, Dr. Fowler insists, are really the text of the discourse. The speech of Juno (18-68) is a lesson in the virtue of constancy in right doing in spite of all opposition and all calamity. It is a lesson with special application to a question deeply interesting at that time to the Roman world (217-218).

This is the question of transferring the capital from Italy to the eastern Mediterranean, whether to Byzantium as Mommsen suggested, or to Alexandria, or to the plains of Troy. Owing to the want of contemporary history and correspondence, we are almost entirely in the dark about popular feeling in Rome when these odes were written; we have to guess it mainly from the poetry of the day, which may be a pretty sure guide, but one certainly difficult of interpretation. We must date this ode in the year 27 B. C. or somewhat later, since the name Augustus is found in it, which was assumed in January of that year. There must just at this time have been a feeling, as we know there was at the end of the life of Julius, that a change of capital was possible or even imminent; once again attention had been specially directed to the East for two or more years, and for long past it had been felt that the eastern half of the Empire was now of much greater moment in many ways than the western. The 'Pan-Romans' of that day would like to be rid of the old republican associations of the city, and at the same time to be nearer the centre of the Empire. Pompey's conquests, as well as his great imperial powers, had wrought a great change, both political and geographical, and it was now realized more forcibly than ever before that for intellect, philosophy, even religion, Rome would have to draw upon the East, not as yet from the comparatively uncivilized West, nor even from Africa. The bilingual educated class was at this time showing a distinct tendency to drift from Rome towards the pleasant cities of the Asiatic coast, as the reader of Horace's odes will have noticed in the seventh ode of the first book.

Dr. Fowler admits (218) that it does not at all follow that Augustus had any such plan in his mind; but there are, he says, strong indications that the Romans suspected it. At this point he refers to a paper by Dr. Walter Leaf. It is published in the English Journal of Philology 34 (1918), 283-289, under the title Horace Carm. I 14. Before, however,

I turn to that paper I want to call attention to the fact that Dr. Fowler suggests that the beauty and the fervor of Book 8 of the *Aeneid*, of which the theme is 'Aeneas at the site of Rome', may have been inspired by the fear of losing the capital; he seems to see the same feeling in Horace, *Odes* 3. 5. 12 (218-219):

The grand speech which Livy puts into the mouth of Camillus at the end of his fifth book, also probably written in these years, urging the people not to move from their own glorious site to that of the captured Veii, was surely inspired by the same motive. I have strong feeling, of which I have more to say directly, that there is more than an accidental analogy between these chapters of Livy and the *Odes* I am discussing. I think that Horace and Livy must have known each other and compared ideas. There is no doubt that Livy was writing his first decade while the first three books of the *Odes* were being put together; and two literary Italians must have known something of each other at Rome.

The matter was discussed, I may note, by Robert Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, 1-2 (London, 1876), in terms largely anticipating Dr. Fowler's treatment.

The papers on Niebuhr and Mommsen are immensely interesting. We ought to have more papers of this sort. They make me think of the paper on Johan Nicolai Madvig, by H. Nettleship, in his *Lectures and Essays*, Second Series, 1-23 (Oxford University Press, 1895). One may recall the *Memoirs* of various scholars, prefixed to collected editions of their work: e. g. the memoir of Henry Nettleship, prefixed to the book just referred to; of W. Y. Sellar, by Andrew Lang, prefixed to Sellar's *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*; of James Adam, by his wife, Adela Marion Adam, prefixed to his book, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*; of Mortimer Lamson Earle, by Sidney G. Ashmore, in *The Classical Papers of Mortimer Lamson Earle*. Mention may be made, too, of the book by W. W. Jackson, entitled *Ingram Bywater, The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar, 1840-1914* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* II.110).

It remains to consider briefly the paper by Dr. Walter Leaf, on Horace, *Carmina* 1.14, referred to above.

Dr. Leaf accepts, as the beginning of all criticism of Horace, *Carm.* 1.14, the express statement of Quintilian (8.8.44), that this Ode is an allegory, and that Horace is concerned primarily in reality with the Ship of State. He believes that no fresh light upon the interpretation of the Ode has been thrown since Orelli's day. Orelli sums up the views set forth up to his time.

To interpret the Ode, says Dr. Leaf, we must answer two questions: (1) Why is the Roman State called a 'Pontic Keel?', (2) and why is there special danger for her in the channel between the Cyclades?

A poet cannot venture upon allegory without weighing every word and assuring himself that it has a definite reference to his hidden meaning. But he may have it in view to obscure that meaning for reasons of his own. Horace may have wished the careless reader to be misled by the parallel of Pontica and Cyclades with Bithynia and Carpathium; but if he was really writing an allegory to be understood only by the *σωφρονες*—and that is presumably the case here—he must have

been all the more anxious in the choice of words which should lead those for whom he was writing to see through the veil. And I believe that it is still possible to understand, even for us.

To reach such understanding, Dr. Leaf tells us that we must consider, in connection with our Ode, the prophecy of Juno in Horace, *Carm.* 3.3.57-60:

Sed bellicosis fata Quiritibus
hac lege dico, ne nimium pii
rebusque fidentes avitae
tectae velint reparare Troiae.

Now, in this stanza, Dr. Leaf sees "a denial, almost semi-official", of the correctness of the intention, ascribed, by gossip (Suetonius, *Julius* 79.3), to Julius Caesar, and by similar rumors, to Augustus, to transfer the seat of Roman government from Rome, perhaps to Alexandria, Troas, or to Ilium.

The earlier poem, I believe, deals with the same theme; it is a covert but passionate protest against the removal of the seat of government—passionate because the danger is sincerely believed to be a real one, and covert because it would not be safe to utter an open attack upon the policy which to all appearance was seriously entertained by Augustus.

Dr. Leaf notes (285-286) that certain actions of Octavianus—for instance, the fact that for two full years after Actium he never went to Rome, but spent nearly his whole time in Egypt or on the West coast of Asia Minor—would lend support to the view that he purposed to transfer the seat of government from Rome. Indeed, such a purpose might even be a statesman-like purpose, the outcome of a desire to unite the Eastern and the Western halves of the Empire, by fixing the seat of government somewhere on the borders of the two, say at Ilium, the legendary birthplace of Rome. Horace's Ode is, to Dr. Leaf's mind, perfectly adapted to voice the fears concerning such a transfer (287):

The battered ship of state is represented as having reached the harbour-bar, and as being about to enter when there is a sudden danger that it will set out to sea again, unfitted and unseaworthy. That is exactly the state of feeling which must have prevailed at Rome when it was learnt that Augustus was not coming further than Brundisium. Horace implores the ship boldly to put into port—let the government be once more settled, and settled finally, in the old capital.

We get now an answer to our first question. By this expression, says Dr. Leaf, Horace says in effect, 'I admit that you have become a Pontic power'. But, he goes on to say, the phrase 'Pontic power' is after all no more than a grand phrase; in times of stress, policy must not be built on fine phrases alone. Those who upheld Augustus's purpose, not Horace, could call the Ship of State 'Idaeae', for "An Idaean ship would be sailing home, if it were bound for Ilium, and that is where Horace is eager that it should not sail" (287).

We have also the answer to our second question—that about the channels of the Cyclades. They point straight to Ilium; through them every ship bound from Italy for the Hellespont must pass. There-

fore, when Horace says, 'Avoid the Cyclades', he means 'Do not sail for Ilium'.

Dr. Leaf believes that we must interpret Horace, Carm. 1.15, especially the opening lines, in close connection with 1.14 (287-288). In these opening lines we have Idaean ships at once, "with all prominence; the purpose of the ode is to bring out to the full the disasters which did once follow a voyage of Idaean ships to Ilium; the moral is obvious". Further, says Dr. Leaf, the narrow seas, indicated by *freta*, "can, for a ship on a voyage from Sparta to Ilium, only be the very channels mentioned in the preceding line, the *aequora interfusa Cyclidas*".

Dr. Leaf then concludes that the poems were composed at the time of Augustus's visit to Brundisium in the winter of 31-30, and express "the incredulous indignation with which the Romans heard that he was to sail away again without coming to Rome" (we must, he says, set a question mark, not an exclamation point, after *fluctus*, in 1.14.2). The two poems may first have been circulated privately among sympathizers of Horace's position. If the two odes should become general property, the ode on Nereus (1.15) might well pass in those days, as it has always passed since, for a purely mythological poem on the old theme of Troy. If asked questions about 1.14, Horace might say (288),

with an air of extreme innocence, "Of course, the ship is that on which Caesar has just arrived in Brundisium, and in which I hear, with the greatest alarm for his personal safety, that he means to sail back to Samos. It is an appeal to him not to run such a risk". The ode would thus be a pendant to the other in which he appeals to Virgil's ship to bring him safe home. . .

Dr. Leaf reminds us that the voyage from Samos to Brundisium was stormy and dangerous; the return voyage through the narrow seas and lee-shores of the Cyclades was full of risks.

To know that the emperor was coming at such a season had been to Horace a distressing anxiety; his one desire was the affectionate longing that such a danger should not be undertaken again.

In connection with all this Dr. Leaf urges that *occupa*, in verse 2, might mean 'cling', as well as 'enter'.

I quote Dr. Leaf's concluding paragraph:

When Augustus returned to Rome eighteen months later, in August 29 B. C., the policy of any removal of the capital was finally abandoned, and there was no longer any harm in publishing the ode. But Rome did not forget the fright it had had, and it is evident that later on it was worth while to let Horace, in the series of odes on patriotism written with the approval of Augustus, put an end once and for all to rumours, by placing a denial of them in the mouth of Juno. But the first expression of alarm, with its double meaning, remains, when properly interpreted, a pretty piece of wit, a real "*curiosa felicitas*".

I have no doubt that it will be very interesting to others, at it was to me, to find two scholars arriving, independently, at the same conclusion, as Dr. Fowler and Professor Frank did with respect to the Carmen Saeculare, and as Dr. Fowler and Dr. Leaf did with respect to the much discussed passage of Horace, Carm. 3.3. Dr. Leaf's bringing of Carm. 1.15 into relation with this matter is most ingenious.

C. K.

Pictures from Roman Life. Bulletin of the Extension Division, Indiana University, Vol. VI, No. 4. By Lillian Gay Berry.

After a brief discussion of the importance of the visual aids to education, the author lists the slides available for distribution through the Extension Division. These sets consist of 51 slides on The Home, 51 on Dress, Education, and Travel, 54 on Amusements, 43 on Industrial Arts, Crafts, and Trades, 47 on Art, and 70 on Caesar's Gallic War. Good brief lists of books on Roman Life and on Caesar, suitable for the High School Library, conclude the pamphlet.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

EVAN T. SAGE

The Teaching of High School Latin. Maryland School Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 5 (September, 1921). Issued by the State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland.

This is the most recent State syllabus. The point of view from which it was prepared is indicated in the Foreword, by Superintendent Albert S. Cook:

Latin has a place in the high schools but it will confirm itself in that place only if the teacher handles it in a rational, human, up-to-date way, thinking at least as much about his manner as about his matter . . . it is hoped that this pamphlet will serve not merely as a quantitative syllabus, but as a working manual of method as well. . .

Chapter I deals with the value of Latin. The various values are considered under three heads, practical, cultural, and disciplinary. There is no mention of any challenge of the doctrine of formal discipline, nor would the teacher be aware that the question of transfer of training is still open, or even that such a question exists at all.

The four-year Latin course is then outlined year by year. Considerable attention is paid to word-study in the first year. Additional material is specified for the second year, especially a study of suffixes, and the increase in English vocabulary through the study of derivatives is prescribed for the third and fourth years as well. The vocabulary is that of Professor Lodge. The reading-matter prescribed is as follows: Caesar, Gallic War, 1-4, or their equivalent, but without mention of Nepos or any easier material; Cicero, Cat. 1-4 (two of these may be read at sight), Manilian Law, and Archias; Vergil, Aeneid 1-4, (at least two books are to be read at sight). Such a course seems too rigid to get the best results for either teacher or pupil. Perhaps, too, the requirements in syntax are too heavy for the first year. There is no suggestion that the pupil who will not continue Latin beyond the first or the second year should receive any special consideration. Satisfactory attention is paid to content throughout.

Chapter III deals in a helpful fashion with Methods and Special Devices for the four years. The all-important point in the first year is declared to be mastery of forms; time-tests are recommended as a